SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Study Team found that there is significant congestion in the study area. In addition, there are a number of issues that should be addressed to enhance pedestrian flows and safety in the study area. The most congested streets are 23rd, K, L and M Streets. The most critical location is Washington Circle where several heavily traveled corridors converge. PM peak hour volumes and congestion are greater than AM peak hour.

The Study Team developed a list of recommended improvements to address existing transportation issues and provide enhancements to traffic flow in the study area. These improvements are summarized in Figure 11 and described in the Existing Transportation Issues and Proposed Improvements section of this report. The Study Team recognizes that even with the implementation of the recommended improvements, many of the study area intersections will continue to operate at level of service F, especially during the PM peak hour. The type of improvements that need to be implemented to bring all of the study area intersections to acceptable levels of service are extensive and of a regional nature. They may include the following:

1. Construction of an interchange at the site of the Washington Circle.
2. Reconstruction of the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge to provide necessary downstream capacity and alternative routes to traffic that traverse the study area.
3. Widening or reconstruction of the Key Bridge to provide downstream capacity.

It should be noted, however, that the replacement of the Washington Circle with an interchange is very unlikely because it would be difficult to construct an interchange that fits well with the existing character of the study area.

The Study Team conducted a full evaluation of three development options at the site. The trip generation for a fourth option was calculated to gauge the potential effects on traffic operations that would result from the implementation of an option that included office and retail development. The type and levels of development for each of the study options are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9
Types and Levels of Development for Study Options

Option	Land Use	Square Footage	Dwelling Units
1	Residential	165,575	166
	Library	19,060	N/A
	Total	***184,635***	***166***
2	Residential	184,635	185
	Office	165,575	N/A
	Library	19,060	N/A
	Total	***369,270***	***185***
3	Residential	369,270	369
	Overlay Commercial	73,258	N/A
	Library	19,060	N/A
	Total	***461,588***	***370***
4	Residential	184,635	185
	Overlay Commercial	77,575	N/A
	Office	88,000	N/A
	Library	19,060	N/A
	Total	***369,270***	***370***

As shown in Table 10, the net new trips for Option 1 are negligible. Option 2 is expected to generate more trips during the AM peak hours than the other options but less trips than Option 3 and 4 during the PM peak hour and on a daily basis. The Study Team estimates that Options 3 and 4 will have the greatest trip generation during the PM peak hours and on a daily basis.

Table 10
Trip Generation for Study Options

Option	AM Peak Hour Trips			PM Peak Hour Trips			Daily Trips (2-Way)
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
1	-24	24	0	7	-10	-3	130
2	77	42	119	29	82	111	980
3	-7	77	70	129	72	201	1,960
4	47	47	94	113	120	232	1,960

Note: The tables Site Trip Generation – Option 1, Site Trip Generation Option 2, Site Trip Generation Option 3 and Site Trip Generation Option 4 included in Appendix G present detailed information on the trip generation calculations for the four options.

The evaluation of trip generation, site impacts and levels of service indicates that the implementation of Options 1 and 2 would have a negligible negative effect on traffic operations in the study area. The implementation of Option 3 would have a marginal negative effect on traffic operations in the study area. Even though the Study Team did not conduct a full evaluation of Option 4, the trip generation estimates indicate that the effects on traffic operations associated with the implementation of this option is likely to

be the same as the effects of Option 3. The differences in traffic impacts between the study options are small enough to indicate that the level of necessary mitigation measures is not greater for any of the development options evaluated in this study.